

REMARKS

Claims 1-98 were pending in the subject application. Claims 1 and 37 have been amended. Claims 2, 5, 18-20, 23, 31-33, and 46-62 have been canceled without prejudice; and Applicant reserves the right to present these claims (as well as original claims 1 and 37) in a divisional application. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-4, 6-17, 21-22, 24-30, 34-45, and 63-98 remain pending in the subject application.

Claims 1 and 37 have been amended, and claims 2, 5, 18-20, 23, 31-33, and 46-62 have been canceled, to narrow the claims to the restricted subject matter of Group 4. More specifically, claims 1 and 37 have been amended to narrow the claims to compounds where V is CH_2 -, -CH=CH- , or $\text{-C}\equiv\text{C-}$, and $\text{A}^1\text{-A}^4$ do not contain a ring. Support for the amendments may be found in the originally filed specification (including the originally filed claims) – more specifically, for example, at paragraphs 27 through 37. No new matter was added. None of the amendments is being introduced for reasons of patentability, nor have any claims been canceled for reasons of patentability.

Interview Summary

Applicants wish to express their gratitude and thanks for the personal interview extended by Examiner Robinson on January 9, 2004. No demonstrations were conducted. All of the claims were discussed generally; and no specific prior art references were discussed. Applicants' representative reiterated the arguments (as set forth in Applicants' prior response) against the Examiner's enablement rejections in Examiner's prior office action, and explained how the various embodiments of Applicants' invention are fully enabled.

The Examiner noted that claims of elected Group 4 were patentable but expressed concern over the burden of fully examining the non-elected subject matter. The Examiner proposed that narrowing the claims to the restricted subject matter of Group 4 would put the case in condition for allowance. While Applicants continue to assert that the MPEP requires full patentability examination of withdrawn claims directed to non-elected inventions where the elected claims are

found to be allowable and the application includes appropriate linking claims, Applicants agreed to narrow the claims to the subject matter of elected Group 4 in order to advance prosecution and to ease the burden on the Examiner. During the interview, Applicants' representative stressed that Applicants reserved the right to present any canceled claims (and the original versions of any amended claims) in divisional applications to be filed in the future.


Miscellaneous

In view of the fact that the Examiner has maintained the restriction and election of species requirement, Applicants wish to note on the record that the Examiner has implicitly found that the species not rejoined into the allowable generic claims remaining are patentably distinct from each of the species examined. See MPEP § 808.01(a).

No fee is required in connection with the filing of this Amendment. If any fees are deemed necessary, authorization is given to charge the amount of any such fee to Deposit Account No. 08-2525.

Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Peter Tu", is written over a horizontal line.

Attorney for Applicant(s)
Peter Tu
(Reg. No. 43,207)
340 Kingsland Street
Nutley, NJ 07110
Tel: (973) 235-2884
Fax: (973) 235-2363